

**MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS
WESTERN DISTRICT**

LORRIE LANHAM

APPELLANT,

**v.
DIVISION OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY**

RESPONDENT.

DOCKET NUMBER WD72394

DATE: April 26, 2011

Appeal From:

Labor and Industrial Relations Commission

Appellate Judges:

Division One: Gary D. Witt, Presiding Judge, James E. Welsh, Judge and Alok Ahuja, Judge

Attorneys:

Lorrie Sue Lanham, Appellant Pro Se.

Larry R. Ruhmann, Jefferson City, MO, for respondent.

MISSOURI APPELLATE COURT OPINION SUMMARY

**MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS
WESTERN DISTRICT**

LORRIE LANHAM,

APPELLANT,

v.

DIVISION OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY,

RESPONDENT.

No. WD72394
Commission County

Labor and Industrial Relations

Before Division One: Gary D. Witt, Presiding Judge, James E. Welsh, Judge and Alok Ahuja, Judge

Lorrie Lanham appeals the decision of the Labor and Industrial Relations Commission denying her unemployment benefits.

APPEAL DISMISSED

The Labor and Industrial Relations Commission found that Lanham's employment with Heartland Regional Medical Center was terminated after she committed misconduct connected with her work by her refusal to submit to a drug test.

We cannot begin to consider the possible merits of Lanham's points on appeal due to gross inadequacies in her appellate brief. Lanham's appellate brief fails to meet even the most basic mandatory requirements of Rule 84.04. She has failed to cite to both the factual record and to legal authority for her claims on appeal. Pro se appellants are held to the same standards as appellants represented by counsel and to entertain her claims further would require this court to serve as an advocate, which it cannot do.

Ex gratia we note that even if we were to try to attempt to decide the merits of Lanham's claim, her only argument pertains to whether she voluntarily quit her employment, which was not the basis upon which the Commission denied her unemployment benefits. By failing to argue that the Commission committed error in finding that she committed misconduct in connection with work to support a denial of her unemployment benefits, the point is waived on appeal.

Opinion by Gary D. Witt, Judge

April 26, 2011

This summary is UNOFFICIAL and should not be quoted or cited.
